



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,254	04/09/2004	Shahriar Shane Taremi	JB06017US01	1701

24265 7590 10/21/2004

SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990)
2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD
KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530

EXAMINER

ROOKE, AGNES BEATA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,254	TAREMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Agnes B Rooke	1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

- I. Claims 1-5, 14-33 and 52, 53 drawn to a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:4, SEQ ID NO:6, SEQ ID NO:8, SEQ ID NO:10 and SEQ ID NO:12, and to a crystal with the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:4, SEQ ID:6, SEQ ID NO:8, SEQ ID NO:10, and SEQ ID NO:12; where crystal effectively diffracts X-ray; where a crystal is bound to a given compound; where polypeptide has given RMSD, classified in class X, subclass X, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 6-12, drawn to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO:3, SEQ ID NO:5, SEQ ID NO:7, SEQ ID NO:9, SEQ ID NO:11, and a vector and a host cells, and a method producing a modified Hdm2 protein classified in class 435, subclass 69.1; class 536, subclass, 23.1.
- III. Claims 13, drawn to a method of identifying an agent for use as an inhibitor of Hdm2, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- IV. Claims 34-39, drawn, to a method of producing a crystal classified in class 533, subclass 50.

- V. Claims 40-47, and 55-57 drawn to a computer for producing a three-dimensional representation of the polypeptide, classified in class 700, subclass 1+.
- VI. Claims 48, drawn to a method for obtaining structural information concerning a molecule of unknown structure by X-ray diffraction, classified in class 700, subclass 1+.
- VII. Claims 49-51, and 54, drawn to a method of designing a potential inhibitor, classified in class 700, subclass 1+.
- VIII. Claims 55-57, drawn to a method for evaluating the ability of a potential inhibitor to associate with the polypeptide, classified in class 700, subclass 1+.

Should invention I be elected, applicants are required to select one amino acid sequence from Invention I. This is not Election of Species.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The nucleic acids of Invention II are related to a protein of Invention I by virtue of encoding the same. The nucleic acid molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the protein in a host cell as cited in Invention II. Although nucleic acid molecule and protein are related, since nucleic acid encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because the protein product can be made by another materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the

Art Unit: 1653

nucleic acid may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as hybridization assay.

Inventions I and III/IV/V/VI/VII/VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the inventions are distinct because the polypeptide of invention I can be used in many different methods as suggested in inventions III/IV/V/VI/VII/VIII. Therefore, the inventions are distinct.

Inventions II and III/IV/V/VI/VII/VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the methods of invention III/IV/V/VI/VII/VIII cannot utilize the nucleic acid of invention II in their steps or procedures. Therefore, the inventions are distinct and not related.

Invention III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII are related because they all use the same polypeptide of invention I in their methods. However, at the same time, the methods of inventions III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII are distinct because they utilize different steps, different modes of operation, different procedures and possess

Art Unit: 1653

different starting and ending points. Also, the methods can be used independently of each other, and each and every of them can utilize a polypeptide that is different from invention I. Therefore, the inventions are distinct.

Because the inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for the examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria

Art Unit: 1653

for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the Invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agnes Rooke whose telephone number is 571-272-2055. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax

Art Unit: 1653

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

AR

Karen Cochrane Carlson PhD

KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER